

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are requested.

In response to the Final Rejection mailed October 23, 2002, the following new title is provided --Motor Shaft Caulked Within Groove Of Eccentric Load--.

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, rejection, the substitute specification has been amended at pages 11 and 18 in accordance with the personal interview conducted on December 19, 2002.

With regard to the substitute specification not being entered because it does not include a statement as to a lack of new matter, please see page 9, lines 6-7 of the Response filed August 8, 2002, which expresses that no new matter has been added by the substitute specification. Accordingly, entry of the substitute specification is hereby requested.

And, with regard to the prior art rejections, claims 9, 10, 13, 16 and 18 have been amended in accordance with the personal interview conducted on December 19, 2002. And, claims 12 and 21-28 have been cancelled.

The courtesies extended by Examiner Elkassabgi and Examiner Tamai during the personnel interview conducted on December 19, 2002 are greatly appreciated. During the interview, the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, rejections were discussed, as were the prior art rejections.

During the interview it was agreed that the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, rejections could be overcome by amending the specification so as to describe features and structure of the instant invention with the same terminology as used in the claims. Accordingly, the substitute specification has been amended at page 11 and page 18 to describe the invention with terminology used in the claims. As with the substitute specification filed August 8, 2002, no new matter is added by these amendments to the specification.

Additionally, proposed drawing amendments, and formal drawings, for Figures 3 and 8 are also provided so as to correspond Figures 3 and 8 with the amendments made to pages 11 and 18 of the substitute specification. The Examiner is respectfully requested to approve the proposed drawing amendments and accept the formal drawings.

With regard to the prior art rejections, Examiners Elkassabgi and Tamai explained how claims 9 and 21 were being read on JP '549. Also, though no specific claim language was agreed upon to define around the prior art references relied upon by the Examiner, Examiner Tamai expressed that in order to define a claim around these references this claim would have to recite at least one feature that is lacking from each of these references such that the claim would be prevented from being read on a combination of these references.

Accordingly, in order to further distinguish the instant invention from JP '549 and JP '170, either taken alone or in combination, claim 9 has been amended to recite that the caulked portion extends into the groove and is positioned such that defined in the end surface is

a recess which opens into said groove and does
not extend completely across said end surface

Such a feature is clearly shown in Figure 3, and is not taught by either one of JP '549 or JP '170.

In this regard, though the recess 7 of JP '549 can arguably be said to be in an end surface, JP '549 does not show the recess to open into the groove 6. Please see Figure 1 of JP '549, which shows the recess 7 to be delimited on four sides such that it does not open into the groove 6. This is contrary to what is recited in amended claim 9 and shown in Figure 3, wherein the recess opens into the groove 13.

Also, with regard to JP '170, while the recess resulting from the caulking operation thereof does open into the groove, this recess extends completely across the end surface in which it is defined. Please see Figure 4, for example. This is contrary to what is recited

in amended claim 9 and shown in Figure 3, wherein the recess does not extend completely across the end surface.

Accordingly, because claim 9 now recites a feature that is lacking from each of JP '549 and JP '170, any combination of these references would not result in the invention as now recited in claim 9. Thus, claim 9 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the pages of the specification and claims which changes have been made by the current Amendment. The attached pages are captioned **"Version With Markings To Show Changes Made."**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner believes that any issues remain which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative by telephone to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Masayuki SHIBUTA

By: 

Joseph M. Gorski
Registration No. 46,500
Attorney for Applicant

JMG/adb
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
January 10, 2003